

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged Applicant's claim of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d); rejected claims 17 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing new matter not described in the specification; rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-12, 18-20, 22, 24, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 04-367997 to *Kumazaki*; rejected claims 5, 17, 21, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumazaki* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0234799 to *Lee*; rejected claims 7 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumazaki* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0034375 to *Suda*; and rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumazaki* in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 2001-282219 to *Ryoji*.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 5-8, 10-12, and 20-27. Independent claims 1 and 12 are amended to clarify the previously recited subject matter. Claims 5-8, 10, 11, and 20-27 are amended to maintain consistency with claims 1 and 12. Support for the changes to claims 1 and 12 may be found in the specification at, for example, page 21, line 18, to page 22, line 20, and Fig. 5.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, and 17-28 will remain pending in this application.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the specification. (Office Action, p. 3.) In particular, the Examiner asserts that “displaying a portion of the image on an entirety of a display screen and reducing the size of the portion,” recited in claims 17 and 28, is not described in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 17 and 28 depend from claims 5 and 21, which in turn depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively. Claim 17, and claim 5, from which it depends, require, for example, a display device wherein the attribute information indicates an entirety of the image as the predetermined information and “wherein the display unit displays a portion of the image on an entirety of a display screen and the control unit reduces the size of the portion.” These features are supported in the specification which discloses, for example, “When the magnify/display button 74 of the remote controller 10 is pressed ... the whole information of the presentation image is magnified in the desktop area including the presentation image displaying range, by reducing the display range.” (See pp. 22:21-23:4, emphasis added.) In other words, when the entire image on a display screen is magnified, the control unit reduces the displayed portion of the image by reducing the display range. Claim 28 is directed to a method reciting features corresponding to those of claim 17. Accordingly, the features recited in claims 17 and 28 are supported by the above-cited portion of Applicant’s original disclosure and, claims 17 and 28 do not recite new matter. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-12, 18-20, 22, 24, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Kumazaki*. In order for *Kumazaki* to anticipate Applicant's claimed invention under Section 102(b), each and every element of each claim in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in the reference. Further, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” (See M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).) *Kumazaki* cannot anticipate amended claim 1 because the reference fails to teach, at least, “a control unit which determines whether or not the management table includes attribute information for the at least one of the plurality of predetermined information objects included in the image.”

In particular, *Kumazaki* discloses expanding information on a display means 18 in accordance with an expansion ratio determined based on a distance between the display means 18 and a selection means 2. (*Kumazaki*, para. 0009.) For instance, when information displayed by a destination noticeboard 1 is difficult to see, a member may select the information he/she wants to expand on the destination noticeboard 1 from among keys 2a of remote control 2. (*Kumazaki*, para. 0030.) The selected information may be expanded based on the distance of the member from the destination noticeboard 1 using an expansion ratio stored in a ROM 303. (*Kumazaki*, paras. 0041 and 0042.)

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the ROM 303 of *Kumazaki* which stores expansion ratios corresponds to the claimed “management table which stores display attribute information,” as recited in claim 1. (Office Action, pp. 4-5.) However, when information on the destination noticeboard 1 is selected by a member, the information selected is always expanded. *Kumazaki*, therefore, does not disclose “a management table which stores display attribute information for select ones of the plurality of predetermined information objects; and a control unit which determines whether or not the management table includes attribute information for the at least one of the plurality of predetermined information objects included in the image” (emphasis added), as recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable over *Kumazaki*, as are claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, and 11 at least due to the dependence of these claims from claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and allow the claims.

Amended claim 12, although of different scope than claim 1, contains recitations similar to claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, *Kumazaki* cannot support a rejection of amended claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, claim 12 is allowable over *Kumazaki*, and claims 18-20 and 22, 24, 26, and 27 are also allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 12.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant traverses the rejection of 5, 17, 21, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumazaki* in view of *Lee*. Claims 3, 5, 17 and 28 depend from independent claims 1 and 12 and, therefore, include all of the features recited in claim 1 or claim 12. As noted above, *Kumazaki* does not teach or suggest the claimed “determin[ing] whether or not the management table includes attribute information for the at least one of a plurality of predetermined information objects included in the image.” The Examiner cites *Lee* for allegedly disclosing “the size of the image being adjusted according to the distance between the display apparatus and the user.” (Office Action, page 7.) *Lee*, however, does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claims 1 and 12. *Lee*, therefore, fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kumazaki*, and claims 5, 17, 21 and 28 are allowable over the applied references because *Kumazaki* and *Lee*, taken alone or in combination, cannot support a rejection of claims 5, 17, 21 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Furthermore, Applicant traverses the rejection of 7 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumazaki* in view of *Suda*. The Examiner relies on *Suda* for the reference’s alleged disclosure of “enlarging subtitles.” (Office Action, p. 8.) *Suda*, however, also does not disclose or suggest “determin[ing] whether or not the management table includes attribute information for the at least one of a plurality of predetermined information objects included in the image,” as recited in claims 1 and 12. Therefore, *Suda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Kumazaki* and claims 7 and 23 are allowable over the applied references because *Kumazaki* and *Suda*, taken alone or in combination, cannot support a rejection of claims 7 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In addition, Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kumazaki* in view of *Ryoji*. The Examiner cites *Ryoji* for allegedly disclosing “predetermined information being enlarged based on user selection.” (Office Action, pp. 8-9.) *Ryoji*, however, does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of claim 12. *Ryoji*, therefore, fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kumazaki*, and *Kumazaki* and *Ryoji* cannot support a rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable due to their corresponding dependence from independent claim 12.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 13, 2006

By: 
Steven L. Ashburn
Reg. No. 56,636